

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA**

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

**2005 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT**

**Threshold Review Period 7/1/03 to 6/30/04**  
**To the Current Time**  
***And Five Year Forecast to December 2009***

**Commission Members**

Gary L. Nordstrom, Chair (Development)  
David W. Krogh, Vice Chair (Sweetwater/Bonita)  
William Tripp, (Environmental) (resigned 5/05)  
Arthur M. Garcia, (Education)  
Rafael Munoz (Eastern Territories)  
Michael Spethman (Center City)  
Steve Palma (Southwest)  
Richard Arroyo (Business)  
Kevin O'Neill (Planning Commission)

**Staff**

Daniel Forster, Growth Management Coordinator  
Rabbia Phillip, Management Assistant

**May 25, 2005**

(Note: prior to the acceptance by the City Council, the contents of this report represents the findings and recommendations of the GMOC and are not necessarily those of the City of Chula Vista.)

# GMOC Chair Cover Memo

May 25, 2005

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council  
Members of the Planning Commission  
City of Chula Vista

FROM: Gary L. Nordstrom, Chairperson  
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: 2005 GMOC Annual Report (July 2003 to June 30, 2004, to the Current Time and Five Year Forecast)

---

The GMOC is appreciative of the time and professional expertise given by the various City department staff as well as the school districts, water authorities, and Air Pollution Control District in helping us complete this year's annual report. The comprehensive written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC illustrate the commitment of these dedicated professionals to serving the Chula Vista community. Special thanks to Dan Forster and Rabbia Phillip who provided excellent staff support.

I would like to recognize the commissioners of the GMOC: Vice Chair, David Krogh, Rafael Munoz, Michael Spethman, Steve Palma, Arthur Garcia, Kevin O'Neill, Richard Arroyo, and Bill Tripp who resigned to accept an appointment to the Planning Commission. This dedicated and diverse team of citizens read numerous reports, listened to detailed presentations, and participated in hours of thoughtful discussion about the impact of development on the "quality of life" in Chula Vista.

Over the last few years the GMOC has been in the lead identifying ways we can become more responsive to the community and effective in our message to Council. The most important aspects of those changes has been:

- Holding regular public workshops;
- Focusing greater attention on western Chula Vista; and,
- Having greater future vision, by dealing with current issues and looking critically at the next 5 year time period.

And, in this report the GMOC has included a section that deals specifically with proposed changes to the growth management program as a result of the Top to Bottom review. As indicated in the body report, we are seeking Councils direction and ultimate acceptance in principle to the growth management recommendations presented. We say in principle as these recommendations will once accepted, be used to craft the updated growth management ordinance and the updated Program Document, both of which will be reviewed by the GMOC.

As we review the City's growth over the last several years, two things are clear, first there continues to be a significant level of growth, and second the City has done a remarkable job in providing the facilities and services necessary to accommodate this rate of development. It is a testament to the current growth management program, and all the individual actions that have taken place, that we are doing so well. We all hear the complaints about growth, but I know of no other jurisdiction that has handled this level of growth so well, and has maintained a desirable city image.

But, we all know we can and must continue to strive to do better.

Eight of the eleven quality of life thresholds were judged by the GMOC to be in full compliance, and one in partial compliance, these include:

- Fiscal
- Air quality
- Sewer
- Water
- Drainage
- Parks and Recreation
- Police (P1)
- Traffic
- Schools

Three of the thresholds had at least partial non-compliance:

- Library has fallen below the threshold but a program is in place to correct this.
- The Police threshold has two components, Emergency and Urgent response times. The emergency (Priority 1) response time threshold was met but the urgent (Priority 2) response time was not.
- The Fire/EMS response time did not meet the threshold.

The following report includes a more detailed presentation of the eleven threshold standards, identified issues, findings, and recommendations to the City Council.

I look forward to the joint City Council, Planning Commission and GMOC public hearing/workshop.

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA  
GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION  
2005 ANNUAL REPORT**

---

**Table of Contents**

<b><i>GMOC Chair Cover Memo</i></b> .....	<b><i>i</i></b>
<b><i>Report Preface - Quality of Life: A Broad Overview</i></b> .....	<b><i>3</i></b>
<b><i>1.0 INTRODUCTION</i></b> .....	<b><i>5</i></b>
<b>1.1 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1.2 Review Process</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1.3 Growth Forecast</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1.4 Report Organization</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b><i>2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY</i></b> .....	<b><i>7</i></b>
<b><i>3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE</i></b> .....	<b><i>9</i></b>
<b>3.1 FISCAL</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1.1 Five Year Fiscal Forecast .....	9
<b>3.2 AIR QUALITY</b> .....	<b>10</b>
3.2.1 City Programs for Air Quality Improvement .....	10
3.2.2 Alternative Fueled Vehicles .....	12
<b>3.3 SEWER</b> .....	<b>13</b>
3.3.1 Long Term Treatment Capacity .....	13
<b>3.4 WATER</b> .....	<b>15</b>
3.4.1 Water Availability and Distribution .....	15
<b>3.5 LIBRARIES</b> .....	<b>16</b>
3.5.1 Library Building Plan .....	16
<b>3.6 DRAINAGE</b> .....	<b>18</b>
3.6.1 Replacement of Corrugated Metal Pipe .....	18
<b>3.7 PARKS &amp; RECREATION</b> .....	<b>19</b>
3.7.1 Land Threshold Keeping Pace .....	19
3.7.2 School Grounds and Other Recreation Areas .....	20
<b>3.8 POLICE</b> .....	<b>21</b>
3.8.1 Priority 1 Threshold Met .....	22
3.8.2 Priority 2 Threshold Not Met .....	22
3.8.3 Priority 1 Calls Taking Longer Than 10 Minutes .....	23
<b>3.9 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES</b> .....	<b>24</b>
3.9.1 Maintaining Response Time Threshold .....	24
3.9.2 Reporting Management Tool .....	25
<b>3.10 TRAFFIC</b> .....	<b>26</b>

3.10.1	Traffic Signal Adjustment.....	26
<b>3.11</b>	<b>SCHOOLS.....</b>	<b>27</b>
3.11.1	GMOC School Recommendations.....	28
3.11.2	School District Accomplishments.....	28
3.11.3	City Assistance.....	28
<b><u>4.0</u></b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDED GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CHANGES.....</u></b>	<b><u>30</u></b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Background.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Overall Changes – Implementation Measures.....</b>	<b>31</b>
4.2.1	Use of Moratorium .....	31
4.2.2	Statement of Concern .....	31
4.2.3	Use of Master (and or Strategic/Specific) Plans.....	32
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Threshold And Implementation Measure Specific Changes .....</b>	<b>32</b>
4.3.1	No Significant Changes: Air Quality, Water, Sewer, Drainage, Fiscal.....	32
4.3.2	Fire and Emergency Medical Services .....	32
4.3.3	Police .....	33
4.3.4	Traffic .....	33
4.3.5	Parks and Recreation .....	33
4.3.6	Library .....	34
4.3.7	Schools .....	34
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Organization.....</b>	<b>35</b>

---

# Report Preface - Quality of Life: A Broad Overview

---

The GMOC's principal task is to assess the impacts of growth on the community's quality of life and to recommend corrective actions in areas where the city has the ability to act and can make a difference. This is an important and vital service. No other city in the region has an independent citizen body, as the GMOC, to provide this kind of report card to an elected body. In fact, the GMOC has been referred to as the "eyes and ears" of the City Council.

As mentioned, the principal task of the GMOC is to address impacts of growth in areas where the city can act. And, while critical, this aspect is only one part of what constitutes Chula Vista's quality of life. A few examples, existing facility needs, such as curbs and gutters in the southwest, the need has not been created by growth but does impact the residents quality of life. Street and drainage facility maintenance are not directly growth related, but maintenance issues do impact the quality of life. Demographic change, when an area of the city has growth in population without a commensurate growth in housing, means that household size is growing, and facility and service demands increase. While this is a form of growth, it does not fall within the formal purview of the GMOC. Other services are outside the city's jurisdictional realm, such as schools, water, and air quality, and while these issues have thresholds and are discussed within the GMOC report there is actually very little the City can do either legally or practically. Other issues such as health care and housing affordability does have a direct effect on the residents quality of life, but clearly the City's role is limited.

The GMOC takes seriously its role as monitoring the impacts of growth and reporting to the City Council. The GMOC membership also believes that they have a responsibility to express concerns over issues that may not be a part of the formal GMOC purview, but does impact the quality of life for the current and future residents of the City. It is also recognized that there may be no recourse, no action that the City can take either legally or practically, to address such concerns. It is important however for the issues to be raised so that the City Council and the community has a full perspective regarding the City's quality of life.

The GMOC membership is pleased to say that overall the quality of life in the City of Chula Vista is being maintained and indeed even improved. Our once "Eastern Territories" are quickly evolving into one of the most desirable and relatively affordable places to live in the county. The prospects for redevelopment in the west gives rise for opportunities for physical improvements to be realized as they have in the east.

At the same time there are trends which are of concern to the GMOC. The issue of health care in terms of local resources for hospital beds and the availability of emergency room care seem to be eroding. This is not a Chula Vista specific issue, but one that is affecting many communities around the country as the dynamics of health care changes.

Some attributes of physical development in western Chula Vista will be addressed as the redevelopment process proceeds. But, depending upon the rate of this growth, some of the pre-existing need issues may linger for what many feel is too long. Providing parks, curbs-gutters and sidewalks for the southwestern area of the city is being done, and this is recognized and appreciated. So when the GMOC indicates that more is also desired, it is done with recognition and thanks for the significant achievements we have seen in the last 2 years. And, we recognize that the tax base provided by our eastern growth has helped to fund these improvements.

The issue of crumbling drainage infrastructure, particularly old corrugated metal pipe, remains a concern to the GMOC. Although a program is in place which receives funding on an annual basis, and recent years has seen at least a one time spike in funding, we encourage this steady effort to continue.

Some community members indicate their frustration that improvements while planned are taking too long to be built. Pools for competitive meets are an example. Let us say that the GMOC shares these sentiments, but at the same time recognize that these are strategic recommendations that come from other Boards and Commissions, which in the case of pools is the Park and Recreation Commission.

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

In November 1987, the City Council adopted the original Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista establishing “quality-of-life” indicators for eleven public facility and service topics. The Policy addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), a “threshold” or standard, and implementation measures. Adherence to these citywide standards is intended to preserve and enhance both the environment and residents’ quality of life as growth occurs. To provide an independent, annual, City-wide Threshold Standards compliance review, the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was created. It is composed of nine members representing each of the City’s four major geographic areas, a member of the Planning Commission, and a cross section of interests including education, environment, business, and development.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three time frames:

1. A fiscal year cycle to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations, which may have budget implications, therefore the report focuses on the previous fiscal year for detailed data collection, which in this case is July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004.
2. Pertinent issues identified during the second half of 2004 and early 2005 are also addressed. This is to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events.
3. A five-year forecast covering the period from January 2005 through December 2009 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns. This assures that the GMOC has a future orientation.

During this process, the GMOC encourages each City Department and outside agency, which has responsibility for reporting on the threshold status, to review the appropriateness of the threshold and whether new thresholds and or standards should be considered.

## 1.2 Review Process

The GMOC has held 14 regular meetings from July 2004 through May 2005. In addition, GMOC members participated in a City field trip. City Departments and outside agencies completed threshold questionnaires. GMOC members reviewed the questionnaires and, where necessary, asked department or agency representatives to appear in person to make clarifications and to answer questions.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council. This occurs at a public hearing typically held in May or June.



## **1.3 Growth Forecast**

In October 2004 the GMOC “Preliminary” Five Year Growth Forecast was issued<sup>1</sup>. This forecast was issued to provide departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the magnitude of residential growth to be anticipated over the over the next five years. Each department and outside agency was then asked how their respective public facility/service would be able to accommodate that growth. The forecast from January 2005 through December 2009, indicated an additional 12,774 residential units would be permitted for construction in the city, (10,444 in the east and 2,300 units in the west) for an annual average of 2,088 in the east and 460 units in the west.

One of the assumptions of that forecast was that “Building caps are not imposed on development”. In essence, the Permit Monitoring Program adopted by the City Council on April 15, 2003 has imposed such a system to be applied from April 2003 through March 2006. The Permit Monitoring system will lower the number of permits relative to the forecast over that period. However, as the GMOC forecast is for a five-year period, units that were forestalled by the Permit Monitoring Program may after March 2006 come forward. In addition, to be conservative, it is prudent to maintain the estimate of 12,774 residential units over the next 5 years so that facility and service levels are measured against a higher standard. Annual updates will be provided.

## **1.4 Report Organization**

In Section 2 the report provides summary tables of the threshold findings both for the most recent review period and what is expected over the next 5 years.

Section 3 provides a threshold by threshold presentation, presents discussions, issues, acknowledgments, statements of concern, and recommendations as may be made. The thresholds are ordered roughly according to their level of interest or concern.

Section 4 concerns the GMOC’s concurrence with recommended changes in the growth management program in terms of thresholds, implementation measures, and organizational issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> This forecast will be updated prior to presentation to the City Council to reflect actual building permits issued and housing units finished in calendar year 2004. The forecast is available on the City’s web site.

## 2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

<b>2005 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY</b> REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/03 THROUGH 6/30/04		
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Threshold Not Met</b>	<b>Threshold Met</b>
Fiscal		X
Air Quality		X
Sewer		X
Water		X
Libraries	X	
Drainage		X
Parks & Recreation		
<i>Land</i>		X
<i>Facilities</i>		X
Police		
Priority I		X
Priority II	X	
Fire/EMS	X	
Traffic		X
Schools		
<i>Chula Vista Elementary School District</i>		X
<i>Sweetwater Union High School District</i>		X

**2005 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY  
AND FIVE YEAR ASSESSMENT  
January 2005 through December 2009**

Threshold	Threshold Will Be Met	Threshold Likely Met	Potential for Future Non- Compliance	Statement of Concern	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
Fiscal	X				
Air Quality	X				
Sewer	X				
Water	X				
Libraries		X			X
Drainage		X			
Parks and Recreation					
<i>Land</i>		X			
<i>Facilities</i>		X			
Police					
Priority I (81%/Average)		X			
Priority II (57%/Average)			X		
Fire/EMS			X		
Traffic		X			
Schools					
<i>Chula Vista Elementary</i>		X			
<i>Sweetwater Union High School District</i>		X			

## **3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE**

### **3.1 FISCAL**

**Threshold:** The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5- to 7-year period.

The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

#### **THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**Current: In Compliance**

**Future: Threshold Will Be Met**

---

#### **3.1.1 Five Year Fiscal Forecast**

**Discussion:** The GMOC was provided with a 5 year fiscal forecast. Based upon this information the city's growth is anticipated to produce the kinds of land uses that will generate the level of revenue so that the facilities, services, and maintenance needs that will be demanded by this growth will overall also be paid for by this growth .

**Recommendation:** No recommendations at this time.

## 3.2 AIR QUALITY

### Threshold:

### The GMOC Shall Be Provided With An Annual Report Which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the City's development regulations, policies, and procedures relate to, and/or are consistent with current applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the City toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the City has achieved compliance.

The City shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the affect of those efforts/programs on the City of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**Current: In Compliance**

**Future: Threshold will Be Met**

---

### 3.2.1 City Programs for Air Quality Improvement

The GMOC wishes to highlight the ongoing efforts being undertaken by the City of Chula Vista to improve local and regional air quality. The City continues to implement several measures contained in the Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) Reduction Plan adopted by the City Council on November 14, 2000. Following is an explanation of the non-development related air quality programs identified as Action Measures in the CO<sub>2</sub> Reduction Plan that have been active or updated during the reporting period:

### Purchase of Alternative Fuel Vehicles

The City's alternative fuel assets include the operation and maintenance of the following existing alternative fueled vehicles and fueling stations:

#### Alternative Fuel Vehicles

- Chula Vista Transit has 25 CNG Busses (a total 6 additional CNG busses will be delivered in June 2005).
- The Nature Center will receive a dedicated CNG bus in June 2005.
- Six CNG Passenger Vehicles: 4 Vans and 2 Cars.
- Five Neighborhood Electric Cars.
- Honda FCX Fuel Cell Car.

#### Alternative Fueling Station

- Hydrogen Fueling Facility installed at the John Lippitt Public Works Center in April 2003.
- CNG Fueling Station at the John Lippitt Public Works Center.
- Public access to CNG Fueling Facility at the John Lippitt Public Works Center.

### Green Power

Renewable Energy efforts include:

- 4 kw Photovoltaic (PV) system at the John Lippitt Public Works Center.
- 7 kw PV system for Nature Center.
- 30 kw PV system for new Police HQ.
- Additional 4 kw PV system planned at the John Lippitt Public Works Center in 2005.
- Staff to evaluate installation of 1MW PV for the John Lippitt Public Works Center.

### Municipal Clean Fuel Demonstration Project

- The City is continuing to work with SunLine to demonstrate hydrogen Electrolyzer and hydrogen fuel cell bus by 2006. Funding of \$3.4 million from the Department Of Energy (DOE) and the CEC is pending organization of a regional project. The regional project scope will procure up to four fuel cell busses for a two-year demonstration for the San Diego region with Chula Vista as the anchor.

### Municipal Building Upgrades and Trip Reduction

- Facility and infrastructure retrofits are generating savings of 4.7+ MW-hrs/yr.
- The City has replaced 30 refrigerators with EnergyStar rated units since June 2003.
- Past retrofits include upgrading lights, many HVAC systems and other appliances with energy-saving devices. Additional improvements will be made as major capital items will be replaced or refurbished.

- The City has expanded its website opportunities for the public to access information and communicate with staff without traveling to the Civic Center and other City facilities. Planning and Land Use applications as well as Building permit forms and specifications are available via the Internet resulting in trip reduction by City employees and the public.

In addition to the CO<sub>2</sub> Reduction Plan measures, the City has initiated the following programs:

#### Transportation Demand Management

- In March 2003, the City was awarded a \$414,325 grant by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District to develop and implement a transportation demand management program. The program includes an express bus from eastern Chula Vista to downtown San Diego and an express shuttle from eastern Chula Vista to a trolley stop. Council accepted the grants in April 2004 and the program may begin operation in Summer 2005.

#### Light Bulb Exchange Program

- The City partnered with SDG&E to facilitate a light bulb exchange program targeting western Chula Vista. Replacement compact fluorescent lights were provided to 600 households in October 2004.

### **3.2.2 Alternative Fueled Vehicles**

#### **Discussion:**

While it is recognized that the issue of air quality should be addressed on a regional basis, the City of Chula Vista is moving forward in several areas to lower energy consumption and emissions. One area that was of interest to the GMOC in last year's report concerned the acquisition of or conversion of City vehicles which use alternative fuels. It has been reported to the GMOC that a draft policy will be ready for presentation to the GMOC by the end of the second quarter of 2005. In the mean time, interim steps continue to be taken to promote use of alternative fuel vehicles in the City. In November 2004, the City leased a Honda FCX hydrogen fuel cell car. The Cities of Chula Vista, San Francisco, Los Angeles, South Coast Air Quality Management District and the State of New York are a few of the agencies in the US that are currently testing this technology.

#### **Comment:**

The GMOC looks forward to receiving the draft or adopted City policy regarding their use of alternative fueled vehicles.

### 3.3 SEWER

**Threshold:**

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Authority with a 12-18 month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the City's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth, or the City Public Works Department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include:
  - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
  - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth.
  - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
  - d. Other relevant information.

The Authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

#### **THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**Current: In Compliance**

**Future: Threshold Will Be Met**

---

#### **3.3.1 Long Term Treatment Capacity**

**Discussion:**

In about five years the City's current contracted capacity rights with METRO is expected to be exceeded. However, with an allocation from the Southbay Treatment Plant, additional capacity will be available.

For the longer term capacity needs it is the understanding of the GMOC that the soon to be completed Sewer Master Plan will form the basis for reevaluating the sewer capacity fee so that there is sufficient funding to acquire the additional capacity rights. It is also understood that negotiations to acquire those rights are ongoing. The GMOC appreciates the complexity of these negotiations.



<b>SEWAGE Flow and Treatment Capacity</b>							
	00/01 Fiscal Year	01/02 Fiscal Year	02/03 Fiscal Year	03/04 Fiscal Year	Projection for next 18 months	Projection for next 5 years	Projection for "Buildout"
<b>Average Flow (MGD)</b>	14.756	15.316	15.951	16.6	17.88	20.34	26.2*
<b>Capacity</b>	19.843	19.843	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**	20.875**

- Buildout Projection based on the General Plan Update (Steering Alternative). (Adopted General Plan "Buildout" = 26.2 MGD)
- \*\* Increase in capacity is based on the allocation of additional capacity rights resulting from the construction of the new Southbay Treatment Plant.

**Recommendation:**

That:

- (1) the GMOC be advised regarding the allocation of treatment capacity to Chula Vista from the Southbay Sewer Treatment Facility, and
- (2) the status of negotiations to acquire capacity rights for the City's long term sewer treatment requirements.

## 3.4 WATER

### Threshold:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the City a service availability letter from the Water District for each project.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12-18 month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:
  - a. Water availability to the City and Planning Area, considering both short and long term perspectives.
  - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed.
  - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth.
  - d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
  - e. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**Current: In Compliance**

**Future: Threshold Will Be Met**

---

#### 3.4.1 Water Availability and Distribution

### Discussion:

Both of the major water districts serving the City of Chula Vista report that they will be able to meet the water demands of anticipated growth over the next 5 years.

**No Recommendations at This Time**

## 3.5 LIBRARIES

**Threshold:** The City shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by buildout. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the City will not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

#### **CURRENT**

*Not in Compliance*

#### **FUTURE**

*Threshold Likely Met*

---

### 3.5.1 Library Building Plan

**Issue:** Given the population growth of the community the ratio of gross square feet of library space has fallen below the threshold standard of 500 gross square feet per 1,000 population.

The Library Master Plan calls for the construction of a 30,000 square foot full-service, regional library in Rancho Del Rey. This library will be constructed on City-owned property located at East H Street and Paseo Ranchero. This library is expected to be open by summer of 2007.

According to the Growth Management Program "Should the GMOC determine that the Threshold Standard is not being satisfied, then the City Council shall formally adopt and fund tactics to bring the library system into compliance. Construction or other actual solutions shall be scheduled to commence within three years."

As stated above, construction of the Rancho del Rey library is expected to commence this calendar year and be completed by summer of 2007. If this schedule is met there is no need for additional action.

**Acknowledgement:** The City has taken a proactive position and is continuing to actively pursue the Rancho Del Rey Library Planning/Building Plan Program and has placed as a priority the identification of construction funding. A

target completion date of 2007 has been set. The principle reason for the delay was to await notification of whether a library construction grant had been received. Unfortunately, the city was not successful in being awarded that grant.

## 3.6 DRAINAGE

**Threshold:** Stormwater flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering standards.

The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the City's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet the goals and objectives listed above.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**Current:** **Threshold Met**

**Future:** **Threshold Likely Met**

---

### 3.6.1 Replacement of Corrugated Metal Pipe

**Discussion:** For several years the GMOC has supported and strongly encouraged the City's effort to replace aging and in some cases dilapidate corrugated metal pipe (CMP). In fact, the GMOC has urged that more be done.

While the failure of CMP is not a growth related issue, when the pipes fail and there is insufficient drainage, this certainly affects the communities quality of life. The GMOC is pleased to see that increased funding is being applied to this problem.

CMP Replacement/Rehabilitation Funding		
Fiscal Year	Budget	
2002	\$893,989	<sup>1</sup>
2003	\$832,000	<sup>2</sup>
2004	\$481,462	
2005	\$615,500	<sup>3</sup>
2006	\$3,000,000	<sup>4</sup>

1) FY 2002 included Storm Drain Funds and Traffic Relief Funds. All Storm Drain Funds after FY 2003 are utilized to offset the City's costs for managing it's mandated NPDES program. The Traffic Relief Funds were state funds that have been discontinued.

2) FY 2003 was the last year Storm Drain Funds were available for capital purposes.

3) In the current fiscal year, the funds to be expended are for a complete inventory and analysis of the City's system, including televising all 88,000 lineal feet of CMP pipe. Additional amounts yet to be determined will be expended to repair a CMP failure on First avenue near H Street.

4) The amount depicts the amount already borrowed by the City for this purpose and a priority list will be created after the inventory/analysis is completed this year.

## 3.7 PARKS & RECREATION

**Threshold:** Three acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**Current:** *In Compliance*

**Land:** Actual: 3.01 acres per 1,000 residents east of I-805

**Facilities:** Actual Facilities – Based on Parks Master Plan

**Future:**

**LAND:** *Will Be Met*

**FACILITY:** *Threshold Likely Met*

---

### 3.7.1 Land Threshold Keeping Pace

**Discussion:** Current eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory will provide adequate acreage to accommodate up to 92,520 persons with the 3 acres per 1,000 standard.

The 18-month forecast calls for an eastern Chula Vista population of 106,500 (an increase of 14,000), therefore current inventory will need to be increased by 42.00 acres however, the net need is 40.65 acres to meet the 18-month forecast. Within 2005 there is scheduled to be an additional 41.57 acres of park available, namely:

- Sunsetview Park and Santa Venetia Park, 18.77 acres
- Veterans Park, 10.5 acres
- Horizon Park and Windingwalk Park, 12.3 acres

It should also be noted that there will be three other parks under construction by the City during 2005. These parks are:

- Monteville Community Park (Rolling Hills Ranch);
- Saltcreek Community Park; and;
- Mountain Hawk Neighborhood Park (EastLake).

All of these parks should be completed in 2006. Upon their completion, the amount of park acreage to persons should comfortably exceed the threshold standard.

Approximately 133.57 park acres are forecasted to be constructed between June 2004 and December 2009 time frame. This translates to an eastern Chula Vista parkland inventory of 395.05 acres, which is capable

of accommodating a total of 131,700 persons. With the eastern Chula Vista population forecasted to be 128,675 in December 2009, there will be adequate park acreage.

### **3.7.2 School Grounds and Other Recreation Areas**

**Discussion:**

In regard to calculating the 3 acres per thousand standard, the city only counts active recreation areas such as developed parkland typically known as neighborhood, community, and regional parks. The city does not count school recreation areas when calculating whether the 3 acres per 1,000 population ratio standard is being met. However, these areas are used for recreation purposes and are significant in their acreages. The two school districts have a combination of over 450 acres of recreational space within the City of Chula Vista.

In addition, the City owned municipal golf course along the Sweetwater River is a public recreation area but is also not counted toward meeting the 3 acres per 1,000 population standard. In like manner the Otay Valley Regional Park, some of the Sweetwater River "Area", the city owned property adjacent to the KOA site, and areas along the reservoir are not counted toward meeting the 3 acres per 1000 person standard. Private open space, such as golf courses and home owner association pools and open space are also not counted.

The GMOC is not advocating that these areas be counted toward meeting the threshold, only that they be recognized as providing a community resource. The recognition of these areas provides for a better context when assessing the availability of recreational land resources.

### 3.8 POLICE

**Threshold:**

*Emergency Response*<sup>1</sup>: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority I calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

*Urgent Response*<sup>2</sup>: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 57% of the Priority II, urgent calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority II calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.30 minutes) or less (measured annually).

**THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**CURRENT:**

*Emergency response within 7 min.: Threshold Met*

*Emergency response average time: Threshold Met*

*Urgent Response within 7 minutes: Threshold Not Met*

*Urgent response average time: Threshold Not Met*

**FUTURE:**

*Emergency response within 7 min.: Threshold Likely Met*

*Emergency response average time: Threshold Likely Met*

*Urgent Response within 7 min.: Threshold Likely Not Met*

*Urgent response average time: Threshold Likely Not Met*

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
<b>Actual</b>			
Emergency Response	82.1%	7 minutes	4:52 min./sec.
Urgent Response	48.4%	7 minutes	9:50 min./sec.

1 Priority 1 - Emergency Calls. Life-threatening calls; felony in progress; probability of injury (crime or accident); robbery or panic alarms; urgent cover calls from officers. Response: Immediate response by two officers from any source or assignment, immediate response by paramedics/fire if injuries are believed to have occurred.

2 Priority 2 - Urgent Calls. Misdemeanor in progress; possibility of severe injury; serious non-routine calls (domestic violence or other disturbances with potential for violence); burglary alarms. Response: immediate response by one or two officers from clear units or those on interruptible activities (traffic, field interviews, etc.).



### 3.8.1 Priority 1 Threshold Met

**Recognition:** The GMOC wishes to recognize that the Police Department has steadily reduced their Priority 1 response times over the last several years to once again clearly meet the growth management threshold.

### 3.8.2 Priority 2 Threshold Not Met

**Discussion:** The Priority 2 Threshold has not been met. The last time the threshold was reached was in FY1996/97. While the GMOC agrees that there is more to the quality of police service than response times, response time is an established community norm that is expected to be met. If it is not met (as will be discussed in section 4) there should be quality of service measures that can be directly associated with a Priority 2 response presented to the GMOC as evidence that in total there remains an acceptable level of service.

The Police Department has requested GMOC support for various upgrades/improvements. While the GMOC is not opposed to any of these, it would be beneficial to understand how implementation of any of these initiatives will specifically improve Priority 2 response times.

Suggested Recommendations	Comments
That the GMOC continue to support the dispatch staffing model and the Dispatch Manager Concept.	The model assists in meeting response time thresholds for priority calls for service.
That the GMOC support continued use of the patrol staffing model and the advance hiring program.	Both will enable the department to respond to calls for service, and seek a 1:1 ratio of officer time spent responding to citizen-initiated calls for service to officer-initiated activities, and a zero vacancy factor in patrol.
That the GMOC continue to support planned upgrades of police technologies, such as MDCs, wireless data transmission to patrol vehicles, and global positioning systems.	It is imperative that the Department continue to build a solid technology infrastructure in order to service a growing community.
That the GMOC continue to support research and evaluation of Internet crime reporting; alternative deployment tactics; such as revised beat configurations, bike patrol; and an aerial platform.	Research staff have looked at several of these ideas over the past year and expect to continue to research various options over the next 18 months, with the aim of maximizing both the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department.

### 3.8.3 Priority 1 Calls Taking Longer Than 10 Minutes

**Discussion:**

During the current reporting period, 5.7% of priority 1 calls (63 of the 1,106 calls available for analysis) had response times greater than 10 minutes. The most frequent type of P1 calls with response times over 10 minutes were robbery alarm calls, which are almost always false<sup>1</sup>. Other P1 calls with response times over 10 minutes included attempted suicide/overdose calls; and fraud now calls. The most typical reasons for P1 response times over 10 minutes were (1) lengthy distances had to be traveled to provide a response; and, (2) a limited number of units were available to respond.

---

<sup>1</sup> A 2002 study of robbery/duress alarm calls to the Department found that 99.7% were false.

### 3.9 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

**Threshold:** Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

#### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**CURRENT:** *Not in Compliance*

**FUTURE:** *Potential for Future Non-Compliance*

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time
Emergency Response	80.0	7 minutes
Actual		
Emergency Response	72.9	7 minutes

---

#### 3.9.1 Maintaining Response Time Threshold

FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times Since 1994		
Years	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes
FY 2003-04	8,420	72.9%
FY 2002-03	8,088	75.5%
FY 2001-02	7,626	69.7%
FY 2000-01	7,128	80.8%
FY 1999-00	6,654	79.7%
CY 1999	6,344	77.2%
CY 1998	4,119	81.9%
CY 1997	6,275	82.4%
CY 1996	6,103	79.4%
CY 1995	5,885	80.0%
CY 1994	5,701	81.7%

**Discussion:** The Fire response time threshold has not been met since FY 2000/01. Although, Fire Chief Doug Perry has indicated to the GMOC that the reasons for the delay are not growth related. Chief Perry points to the fact that the travel time component has not increased in time but actually improved as has dispatch. If growth was responsible Chief Perry maintains that it would be reflected in increased travel time due to either

distance or traffic. But this has not occurred. It is in turn-out time where the increased delay has been experienced. Therefore the issue is one of procedures and management.

At the same time the GMOC was briefed on the establishment of a New Station 8 while keeping the temporary station operational.

Chief Perry believes that within two years response times should be at or very near the threshold level.

### **3.9.2 Reporting Management Tool**

**Discussion:**

Two years ago the GMOC recommended that the Fire Department establish a management tool by establishing a daily reporting function of trip response time by each station by trip. This was reported to have been implemented and the GMOC was advised that it was providing useful information for diagnostic purposes.

Apparently, with the change back to City dispatching, that particular functionality has been lost. The GMOC believes that being able to track each trip on a daily basis is an indispensable management tool and essential for establishing accountability.

**Recommendation:**

That the City Council directs the City Manager to work toward reestablishing a daily report function that provides a written summary of each "Emergency Response" trip by station and identifies the dispatch, turnout, and travel time components.

## 3.10 TRAFFIC

### Threshold:

*City-wide:* Maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS “D” can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

*West of I-805:* Those signalized intersections that do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current 1991 LOS, but shall not worsen.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**Current**      *Threshold Met*

**Future**      *Likely Met*

---

### 3.10.1 Traffic Signal Adjustment

#### Discussion:

When conducting the Traffic Monitoring Program (TMP) it was discovered that the Heritage Road segment between Telegraph Canyon and Olympic Parkway, was not performing to the appropriate level of service, that is it registered an LOS of E which is not acceptable. The finding was unexpected as traffic free flow speed reflected an LOS of A. Upon investigation it was assessed that the problem lay in the long delays at the intersection that was resulting due to the traffic signal timing. That timing is now being corrected.

### 3.11 SCHOOLS

**Threshold:**

The City of Chula Vista shall annually provide the two local School Districts with a 12-18 month forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities.
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
4. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

**THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**CURRENT:** Capacity to accommodate students used now or committed.

**CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Threshold Met*

**SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Threshold Met*

**FORECAST:** Ability to accommodate forecasted growth - Funding and site availability for projected new facilities.

**CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Threshold Likely Met*

**SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Threshold Likely Met*

### **3.11.1 GMOC School Recommendations**

**Discussion:**

Over the years the GMOC has not been hesitant to raise issues and concerns regarding schools. One only has to review the language in past reports to appreciate the degree of alarm that the Commission has from time to time expressed. This year represents a dramatic change in tone. Apprehension and alarm have been replaced with confidence that we are moving forward in a pragmatic and comprehensive manner. Therefore, the GMOC is taking the unprecedented action of not making any school related recommendations for this year.

### **3.11.2 School District Accomplishments**

**Discussion:**

The GMOC is impressed with the level of accomplishments that both school districts have achieved. The financing and construction of new elementary schools are a testament to the functioning of a well oiled machine. In just a couple of years the Sweetwater Union High School District has moved from behind the curve to being ahead of it, and all indications are that they will remain in that position. The completion of the Long Range Facilities Master Plan illustrates how older schools will be brought up to standard and how continued growth will be accommodated. These efforts underscore the GMOC's emphasis that school capacity involves many interrelated factors that define an adequate physical environment. The GMOC is confident that we are moving on the right course.

The financing of future improvements remains perhaps the most critical challenge facing both school districts. This challenge is being met with strategic programming and innovative proposals which deserve a close review.

### **3.11.3 City Assistance**

**Discussion:**

The city is restricted by state law from moderating or slowing growth due to the impacts on schools. At the same time the City has responded to the needs of the school districts by providing data on new growth and facilitating the planning and permit process for construction of new school facilities particularly regarding High School 13. The City has also worked with developers to insure that the necessary roads and utilities are in place when needed to support school construction activities.

The GMOC is please to see this level of interagency cooperation and how it is resulting in success. While the school districts and the city are separate political entities with different sets of responsibilities we are in

the end one community with the common goal of improving the quality of life for all our residents.

The GMOC is hopeful that this positive relationship will continue and that all reasonable efforts at how we as a community can achieve our goals will be pursued.



## 4.0 RECOMMENDED GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CHANGES

### 4.1 Background

As a component of the Growth Management Program the GMOC is tasked with a number of responsibilities, among these include:

- Whether any new threshold should be adopted for any issue is appropriate for its goal.
- Review and make any appropriate recommendations concerning the means of achieving the enforcement outlined.

In concert with this the City Council on April 15, 2003 asked that a “Top to Bottom” review be conducted regarding the growth management program. In June of 2003 the GMOC within it’s annual report concurred with this call for a review. Since that time the GMOC serving in the Infrastructure and Services Subcommittee for the General Plan Update, was able to comment upon and recommend approval for the updated Growth Management Element within the General Plan. Following that the GMOC has been actively engaged with city staff and outside consultants in considering recommendations for more specific growth management program changes.

Consistent with the points above, the focus of the GMOC has been the thresholds and the means of achieving their enforcement, or what is termed “Implementation Measures”.

These two aspects, thresholds and implementing measures, are key to how the growth management program works, particularly at the GMOC level. The thresholds are reasonably well understood as a set benchmarks for a service or facility with a monitoring function to measures how growth may degrade this over time. The second part is, if the benchmark level drops below the acceptable set level what is done about it? This is embodied in the “implementing measures”. Naturally, it is critical to view these two factors in tandem, as it is the implementing measure that is really what directs the nature and extent of public sector response to a threshold failure.

The following recommendations for changes in the City’s growth management program have been endorsed by the GMOC. These recommendations are being presented as an opportunity for Council to provide guidance on direction. Council is being requested to approve the recommendations in principle

While listing a set of recommendations and requesting Council’s acceptance, the actual specific language that will become the updated thresholds and implementation measures will be brought forward by City staff in the form of an updated growth management ordinance and Program Document. It is intended that the recommendations contained herein will in some cases provide specific language and in other guidelines to follow. Both the ordinance and Program Document will be reviewed and commented upon by the GMOC prior to being submitted to Council.

## 4.2 Overall Changes – Implementation Measures

### 4.2.1 Use of Moratorium

The current Growth Management Program document has a provision that if there is a threshold failure for Police, Fire, Traffic, and Parks (after 3 years), “the City Council shall schedule and hold a public hearing for the purpose of adopting a moratorium on the acceptance of new tentative map applications.”

**Recommendation:** This is recommended to be changed to more clearly reflect the intent that the use of a moratorium is to be a consideration. To accomplish this the language is recommended to be changed to: “the City Council shall schedule and hold a public hearing for the purpose of considering the adoption of a moratorium ...”

Further, the moratorium would be placed on building permits not tentative maps. Building permits are more applicable as there may already be thousands of units with approved tentative maps, and therefore a moratorium on new tentative map applications would have no effective result.

### 4.2.2 Statement of Concern

Currently, when a threshold fails or if there is a “serious problem” regarding a threshold that is the responsibility of an outside agency a “Statement of Concern” is issued by the GMOC. Once issued the City Council is required to consider the adoption of a resolution reflecting that concern to be directed to the responsible public agency. This applies to water, air quality, schools, and sewer.

**Recommendation:** There are two recommended changes. The “serious problem ” is changed to just “problem” and that once a “Statement of Concern” is issued, the GMOC may make specific recommendations to the City Council regarding what actions the City may take to assist in resolving this problem. The specific requirement to issue a resolution to the “responsible public agency” is recommended to be removed, although this can still be a recommendation. This sets a better interagency tone, as it focuses attention on what it is the City can do. As such this approach builds a more constructive relationship.

In addition, it is recommended that the term/heading “Statement of Concern” be used in application to all thresholds, if there are issues or concerns that the GMOC wishes to bring to the Council’s attention. This reflects what already occurs in practice and remains an important outlet for the GMOC. Note, the range of what can be expressed in a “Statement of Concern” can be defined. Currently, the GMOC review process is supposed to coincide with the CIP program so that GMOC recommendations can be considered in the capital budget process. In a few instances there may be more programmatic kinds of impacts when terms like “adequately staffed”, as is currently in place, may lead to a comment. A “Statement of Concern” may also advise use of a permit metering system when a threshold is anticipated to fail given development trends so as to avoid the need to consider a moratorium.

### 4.2.3 Use of Master (and or Strategic/Specific) Plans

Master Plans exist or are being developed for Police, Fire, Parks and Recreation, Library, Sewer, and Drainage.

**Recommendation:** While these documents are not part of the threshold, they (or their update), are recommended to be called upon to provide the definition of key terms (like what is adequately equipped and staffed for libraries) so that there is no ambiguity and the GMOC has clear guidance. It is preferable that the GMOC does not feel obliged to come up with their own definitions.

Of particular note, these plans and their implementation and financing strategies must be approved by Council and as such they are already established public policy. Therefore, the action by the GMOC will not result in additional budget implications.

Further, master plans will establish what will be required to meet the growth management thresholds. If the plans are being implemented and the threshold is not being met, the problem may not be growth related but rather one of management of resources. If however the problem persists, the validity of the plan should be called into question.

This is significant, since if the problem is not growth related the use of a moratorium is not employed. The focus becomes the more efficient use of resources not managing growth and therefore not a direct GMOC issue, although any failure for any reason will remain a quality of life concern that can be expressed in a "Statement of Concern".

## 4.3 Threshold And Implementation Measure Specific Changes

### 4.3.1 No Significant Changes: Air Quality, Water, Sewer, Drainage, Fiscal

Editing may be required for clarity and updating but the essence of the threshold will remain unchanged.

### 4.3.2 Fire and Emergency Medical Services

**Recommendation:** That the Threshold be more clearly defined for growth management purposes as arriving at the building address which has been the current and historic practice. This is inserted to deal with the issue if response time ends when you are at the curb or at the door. This will become more pertinent as additional mid and high-rise residential structures are added to the city, as it will take additional time to reach the door, say on the 11<sup>th</sup> floor. This effectively keeps the growth management response time threshold consistent.

**Recommendation:** A multi-step implementation measure is prescribed.

1. If the plan is not being implemented per schedule but the threshold is met, no action is required.
2. If the threshold fails but the Master Plan is being implemented on schedule, then it is a management and not a growth issue.

3. If the threshold fails due to growth related issues and the plan is not being implemented per schedule, then there is the consideration of a moratorium as is currently the case.

Note: the Fire-EMS Master Plan may have a response time standard that is shorter than the growth management standard. But, it will remain the growth management standard which sets the benchmark that should not be lowered due to growth impacts. It is the GMOC's position that the updated Fire Master Plan response time threshold will be a goal set for design purposes. The growth management standard is meant to represent a minimum level of service and is not being changed.

### 4.3.3 Police

If the Priority 1 calls do not meet the response time standard then the same process as currently defined applies, which is to consider a moratorium. Currently, if the Priority 2 call response time is not met due to growth related circumstances, this also results in consideration of a moratorium.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that when a Priority 2 threshold fails a "Statement of Concern" is issued where the GMOC can offer suggestions on how to correct the problem and not necessarily consider a moratorium, which is viewed as an extreme measure for a Priority 2 failure. In addition, the GMOC is in agreement that the quality of service provided on the scene shares a place with response time as being an important quality of life measure. A way to adequately measure this quality of service in a growth management context remains elusive. However, the GMOC may request qualitative measures of Priority 2 service as a possible balance for not meeting the response time standard.

### 4.3.4 Traffic

Two major changes.

**Recommendation:** If the GMOC determines that the traffic threshold will/may fail within 3 years a "Statement of Concern" is issued. Currently, the GMOC has no formal voice to address a forecasted failure. This provides a critical signaling mechanism to Council so that, if they choose, Council can consider whether to impose growth moderating mechanisms such as a permit metering system.

**Recommendation:** Given the distinct nature of urban or urbanizing areas it is appropriate that there be a traffic threshold level of service designated for an "urban street level of service". While the GMOC has not endorsed a specific level of service proposal the justification for such a "dual" system is recognized.

### 4.3.5 Parks and Recreation

**Recommendation:** The significant change is to create a city-wide parks threshold based on the 3 acres per 1,000 standard for additional growth both east and west. If assembling 3 acres per 1,000 proves impractical an in lieu fee based on the value of the

land can be applied at City discretion. Those fees will be used to purchase parkland and facilities as identified in the updated Parks Master Plan.

**Recommendation:** The Parks and Recreation threshold already indicates that “appropriate facilities” will be provided, it is recommended that added to this will be that facilities are adequately staffed (consistent with the Library threshold) with appropriate hours of operation. The GMOC believes that having a facility does not necessarily meet the threshold unless it is open to service the community. Appropriate facilities will be defined in the updated Park and Recreation Master Plan. Staffing and hours of operation can be presented to the GMOC in an annual report that outlines staffing and operating hours by facility, indicating changes from last year, next years plan, with comment on how this provides adequate service. A separate Implementation Measure for these items is proposed to be a “Statement of Concern” and will incorporate language so that this part of the threshold will be recognized as being potentially subject to wide fluctuations based on a number of criteria.

#### 4.3.6 Library

**Recommendation:** The library threshold already includes “adequately equipped and staffed”. It is proposed that “with appropriate hours of operation” be added for the same reason it is being proposed to be added to the Parks and Recreation threshold. Staffing and hours of operation can be presented to the GMOC in an annual report that outlines staffing and operating hours by library, indicating changes from last year, next years plan, with comment on how this provides adequate service.

The Implementation Measure is split between the square footage requirement and the equipment, staffing and hours of operation concern. For the latter, as with Parks and Recreation, a separate Implementation Measure for these items is proposed to be a “Statement of Concern” and will incorporate language so that this part of the threshold will be recognized as being potentially subject to wide fluctuations based on a number of criteria.

#### 4.3.7 Schools

**Recommendation:** The school’s threshold is recommended to be changed so that it specifically indicates that “accommodation” refers to the physical facilities not programs. It also allows for the analysis of sub-areas, to specifically consider the situation in the east as opposed to the west. This may have implications for differentiating financing schemes, the impacts of differing generation rates, and the adoption of non-traditional building footprints.

The Implementation Measure will remain a Statement of Concern, but the focus, as referenced earlier, will be that the GMOC will recommend or suggest through the City Council ways that the City may assist the school district in addressing the identified problem.

## 4.4 Organization

The basic structure and organization of the GMOC as referenced in the current “Program Document” is recommended to remain largely as is with edits to reflect the changes approach that have evolved over time.

One procedural change is recommended. It is recognized that the Planning Commission has an important role in understanding the growth management program and how this may influence their recommendations to Council on various approvals. Having a representative from the Planning Commission on the GMOC remains an essential aspect of our membership and greatly assists in inter commission communication. Further, the Planning Commission should remain as a participant in the yearly GMOC, Council, and Planning Commission annual report workshop.

**Recommendation:** Currently it is stipulated that the annual GMOC report be forwarded to the City Council via the Planning Commission for their action. This is recommended to be changed so that the Planning Commission receives a copy of the GMOC annual report at the same time it is sent to Council, but for their information not action.

Two reasons, first the GMOC is an independent commission and should therefore be on equal standing with all other city commissions, where our recommendations go directly to Council and are not required to be acted on or have to be sent via another commission.

Second, currently when a moratorium is imposed it is directed at tentative maps. Tentative maps are acted upon by the Planning Commission so that in this case a GMOC recommendation would potentially influence a Planning Commission function and should legitimately be reviewed by them for their “action”. However, the use of a moratorium is now being recommended to be shifted to building permits which are not subject to Planning Commission review.